#2

of remote locations to at least one of said plurality of television display structures to control the display of said television display structures.

103. (Amended) A system for enabling video communications with a plurality of remote locations from a central station utilizing dial-up telephone facilities comprising:

video communication structures at said plurality of remote locations for telephonically providing representative dynamic video images;

#3

a plurality of video display structures at said central station for providing a display from said representative image video signals;

telephonic interface apparatus for interconnecting said video communication structures at said plurality of remote locations and said central station to provide at least one-way video communications;

a memory unit for storing programmed operations for sequential remote location communication; and

a control computer coupled to said memory unit and said telephonic interface apparatus for actuating said telephonic interface apparatus to selectively communicate in sequence, from said plurality of remote locations to at least one of said plurality of video display structures in accordance with said programmed operation to control the display of said video display structures.

REMARKS

This Amendment is in response to the office action dated April 26, 2000. Withdrawal of the finality of the previous office action under the transitional procedure of 37 CFR 1.129(a) is respectfully appreciated. Claims 26-115 are presently pending. Claims 26-33 and 50 stand allowed. Applicant appreciates allowance of these claims. Claims 34-49 and 51-115 stand rejected. By this amendment, claims 46, 77, and 103 are further amended. Reconsideration of this application based on the amendments above and remarks below is respectfully requested.

I. Rejections Under 35 U.S.C Section 103(a)

(a) Of Claims 46-47, 49, 52, 54-78, 80-83, 87-89, 93-104, 106-110, 114-115

Claims 46-47, 49, 52, 54-78, 80-83, 87-89, 93-104, 106-110, 114-115 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as unpatentable over the publication entitled *"Vision by telephone"* in view of Yamaguchi (USPN 5,264,929).

The Examiner believes that the *"Vision"* publication discloses a system for monitoring a plurality of scrutiny locations from a central station using dial-up telephone facilities in which images from each scrutiny location are sequentially received and displayed along with graphic display data identifying the picture displayed (page 2). When an alarm sensor at a scrutiny location is triggered, the associated camera takes four snap-shots which are stored and transmitted to the called central station for priority display such that the usual surveillance sequence is interrupted (page 2, column 1, paragraph 4). Two-way audio communication can take place via telephones at each remote site and the central station (see figures on pages 2-3). The Examiner contends that the *"Vision"* publication differs from claims 46-49, 52, 54-78, 80-83, 87-89, 93-104, 106-110, 114-115 in that it does not explicitly provide for the autodialing operation being actuated under control of a programmed computer. However, the Examiner indicates that as shown by Yamaguchi, it is well known in a video surveillance system to use a computer programmed with timing data (CPU 1, RAM 7b, and timer device 8 perform timer-activated operations; col. 11, line 54- col. 12, line 39) to control video sequencing operations (col. 8, lines 25-41), including temporary interruption of the programmed sequence when an alarm signal is detected (col. 18, lines 40-64). The Examiner takes the position that that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate skill to incorporate such timer-activated computer control, as taught to be desirable by Yamaguchi, within the video surveillance system of the publication, in order to automate monitoring operations according to time setting conditions.

Applicant incorporates here by reference his previous arguments distinguishing his claims from the references asserted by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully maintains that the *"Vision"* publication clearly does not contemplate Applicant's disclosed system. Applicant has amended independent claims 46, 77, and 103 to further emphasize the difference of his system from the asserted art. The *"Vision"* system does not provide a continuous and real-time display of dynamic images. Rather, it is a *"slow-scan TV"* system (page 1, left hand column) that

transmits only discrete *'snap-shot'* pictures. The Examiner simply overlooks the *"dynamic"* and real-time nature of Applicant's claimed system.

In direct contrast to Applicant's system, the *"Vision"* system in its *"surveillance mode"* relies exclusively upon human selection of which remote station to access. The publication indicates that in "its surveillance mode a two-digit number keyed into the base station will trigger a 60-way auto teller to dial out to the selected remote station" (page 2, left hand column). In the *"Vision"* system, a human must on the spot, not only 1) select the location to be monitored, but also, 2) must determine the appropriate two-digit number corresponding to the location and finally, 3) must key that number into the station. These three distinct operations present three possibilities for human error to occur. To merely reduce the difference between Applicant's system and the *"Vision"* system to an absence of a computer controlled dialing operation is unfair. The Examiner overlooks the programmed aspects of Applicant's system that eliminate human involvement and possible human error.

In addition, in the *"Vision"* system's *"alarm mode,"* a sensor at the remote site is activated and a succession of snap-shots are taken and transmitted. The Examiner indicates that hence the *"usual surveillance sequence is interrupted."* However, Applicant submits that the *"Vision"* system does not have a programmed and sequential surveillance of different remote sites that is interrupted in the event an emergency is detected at one location. The surveillance of different remote sites depends on human decision. Even in the *"alarm mode,"* when an alarm sensor is activated at a remote site, and a number of snap-shots are made in rapid succession and transmitted, this incoming call in no way impacts the human operator. To resume surveillance, the human operator must subsequently enter yet another different two-digit code corresponding to a different location to select another location to monitor.

The Examiner relies on Yamaguchi to satisfy timer-activated computer control, within the video surveillance system of the *"Vision"* publication. Yet Applicant respectfully submits that the *"Vision"* system defies a combination with Yamaguchi because it clearly teaches away from a computer controlled environment.

Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw her rejection of the claims.

b) Claims 40-45

In paragraph 4 of the office action, Claims 40-45 are rejected as being unpatentable over the *"Vision by telephone"* publication in view of Laycock (USPN 5,202,759) and further in view of Thompson (USPN 5,109,399).

The Examiner rejected claims 40-45 under 35 U.S.C. Section 103(a) as being unpatentable over the *"Vision by telephone"* publication in view of Laycock (USPN 5,202,759) and further in view of Thompson (USPN 5,109,399). The Examiner believes that the publication differs from claims 40-45 in that cameras provide slow-scan video rather than dynamic image television signals. However, the Examiner further contends that Laycock teaches the transmission of dynamic video images over dial-up telephone line in a video surveillance system such that dynamic video, rather than slow-scan, can be provided over the telephone line, which is of limited bandwidth (Figure 4; col. 2, line 65 - col. 3, line 13) such that it would have been obvious to an artisan of ordinary skill to incorporate such provision of dynamic video images, as taught by Laycock, as an improvement over the slow-scan video generation of the *"Vision by telephone"* publication so that a more complete video image of the monitored location can be displayed. Applicant respectfully submits that if it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine the two references to arrive at the claimed invention, why did neither the *"Vision"* publication nor Laycock contemplate or describe the combination. At any rate, neither reference describes the various alert situations that are claimed nor storage of display data on scrutiny locations. For the latter, the Examiner must rely on yet a third reference, Thompson. At best, Thompson discloses a display of a map with textual information (see Thompson, Figure 4). The display is not a real-life image, much less, a dynamic image. With respect to the former, the Examiner has not articulated her position.

c) Claims 48, 51, 90-92, and 111-113

In paragraph 5, claims 48, 51, 90-92, and 111-113 are rejected as unpatentable over the *"Vision by telephone"* publication in view of Yamaguchi, as applied to claims 46, 77, and 103, and further in view of Thompson. These claims are dependent on claims that have been amended and are distinct at least for the reasons urged above. Accordingly, these claims are

distinct at least for the same reasons. Moreover, as urged above, Thompson discloses a display of a map with textual information (see Thompson, Figure 4). The display is not a real-life image, much less, a dynamic image.

d) Claims 53, 79, and 105

In paragraph 6 of the office action, claims 53, 79, and 105 are rejected as unpatentable over the *"Vision"* publication in view of Yamaguchi, as applied to claims 46, 77, 103, and further in view of Fuller et al. These claims are dependent on claims that have been amended and are distinct at least for the reasons urged above. Accordingly, claims 53, 79, and 105 are distinct at least for the same reasons.

e) Claims 34-39 and 84-86

In paragraph 7 of the office action, claims 34-39 and 84-86 are rejected as unpatentable over the *"Vision by telephone"* publication in view of Yamaguchi, as applied to claims 46, 77, and 103, and further in view of Laycock.

Again, the *"Vision"* system does not provide a continuous and real-time display of dynamic images. Rather, it is a *"slow-scan TV"* system (page 1, left hand column) that transmits only discrete *'snap-shot'* pictures. The Examiner simply overlooks the *"dynamic"* and real-time nature of Applicant's claimed system.

In direct contrast to Applicant's system, the *"Vision"* system in its *"surveillance mode"* relies exclusively upon human selection of which remote station to access. The publication indicates that in *"its surveillance mode, a two-digit number keyed into the base station will trigger a 60-way auto teller to dial out to the selected remote station"* (page 2, left hand column). In the *"Vision"* system, a human must on the spot, not only 1) select the location to be monitored, but also, 2) must determine the appropriate two-digit number corresponding to the location and finally, 3) must key that number into the station. These three distinct operations present three possibilities for human error to occur. To merely reduce the difference between Applicant's system and the *"Vision"* system to an absence of a computer controlled dialing operation is unfair. The Examiner overlooks the programmed aspects of Applicant's system that eliminate human involvement and possible human error.

In addition, in the *"Vision"* system's *"alarm mode,"* a sensor at the remote site is activated and a succession of snap-shots are taken and transmitted. The Examiner indicates that hence the *"usual surveillance sequence is interrupted."* However, Applicant submits that the *"Vision"* system does not have a programmed and sequential surveillance of different remote sites that is interrupted in the event an emergency is detected at one location. The surveillance of different remote sites depends on human decision. Even in the *"alarm mode,"* when an alarm sensor is activated at a remote site, and a number of snap-shots are made in rapid succession and transmitted, this incoming call in no way impacts the human operator. To resume surveillance, the human operator must subsequently enter yet another different two-digit code corresponding to a different location to select another location to monitor.

The Examiner relies on Yamaguchi to satisfy timer-activated computer control, within the video surveillance system of the *"Vision"* publication. Yet Applicant respectfully submits that the *"Vision"* system defies a combination with Yamaguchi because it clearly teaches away from a computer controlled environment. The Examiner is simply piecing together teachings from various references with the benefit of hindsight.

Claims 84-86 depend on claim 77 and are distinct at least for the reasons urged with respect to claim 77.

Favorable consideration and allowance of the pending claims are respectfully requested.

Respectfully submitted,
LYON & LYON, LLP

Dated: 10/26/2000

By: _____
Reena Kuyper
Registration No. 33,830

633 W. Fifth Street, Suite 4700
Los Angeles, CA 90071-2066
(213) 489-1600